

Hi Megan.,

I called yesterday re some questions I had about the Villa St. Juliette Winery expansion. Some of these have been answered by a quick visit to the neighborhood I undertook yesterday after I called. Some questions can also wait until April 9, although I normally like to send them forward in advance to speed things along at the hearing. Here are several I will send now to help move thing along.

1. What, if any, changes are in the latest staff report? Looks the same at first glance.
2. Are there any formal changes to staff report recommendations? For example, i seem to recall that the number and size of industry events recommended by the APRC is different than what the applicant is requesting. Have I got that right? If so, is this part of the staff report? Maybe I missed it.
3. Is it unusual for the Department of Conservation to send letters like the one received on this project when wineries are expanded on Williamson Act contract lands? This is the first that I have seen like this. However, the APRC minutes reflect a comment by Lynda Auchinachie regarding a condition of approval resulting from a similar letter received from DOC about the Niner CUP. I do not remember seeing a letter from DOC on that project. What is our general experience and practice with regard to letters from DOC?
4. How is the distance from the community of San Miguel measured to the project site? My mileage indicator yesterday showed 5.2 miles to the main entrance of the subject property from Mission Street and 4.5 miles from Indian Valley Road. Our staff report says 3.14 miles east of San Miguel. Is this as the crow flies or some because of an expanded community boundary?
5. At what elevation is the County noise standard of 65 decibels at the property line estimated - at ground level or straight line? There is considerable variation in terrain in this case between the project site and the sensitive receptor to the east.

Thanks in advance for checking these out.

Have a good weekend,

Ken

Good morning Ken,

1. There have been no changes to the staff report.
2. We have not limited the number of special events or the type based on the DOC concerns and APRCs recommendations.
3. We have not normally received DOC letters regarding winery expansions or new wineries w/ restaurants and commercial kitchens and their compatibility on contracted land. The original Niner MUP received a letter from the DOC which limited the type and number of events approved with their facility. The MUP Holly presented to PC on March 26 was issued a categorical exemption for the expansion of the limited food facility, therefore, DOC did not have the opportunity to comment on the expansion of the restaurant.
4. Because the restaurant must be no further than 5 miles from a village reserve line or urban reserve line, I measured the distance from the San Miguel Urban Reserve Line to VSJ property line. The number should read 3.41, not 3.14 miles.
5. The county's standard for measuring sound level is "ear-level" or approximately 5'-2" above ground level. After speaking directly with Mr. David Dubbink on April 6, 2015, he informed me that this is the elevation the readings and recordings were taken. The speakers that emit the sound and are recorded are set on a tripod at the 5'-2" height above ground level. The unpaved road directly east of the venue sites is where the readings were taken. The elevation between the venue sites and the unpaved road is screened topographically as there is a slight downslope to the road. The emitted sound was recorded at less than 65 db at the unpaved road and property line. The sound is further reduced as you continue past the unpaved road and off the property. Increased distance is going to further attenuate the sound, however, sound does carry up topographically and the house to the east and to the north are both upslope of the VSJ site. Mr. David Dubbink extrapolated the numbers based on the measurements from the property line to consider what the dB level would be for the receptor (residence) to the east. He also extrapolated the numbers for the house to the north based on an emitted dB level of 85 from an event at each of the venue locations for the house to the north. The house to the east, from all venue locations would hear 54dB from an emitting source at each venue location. The house to the north would hear between 52 dB and 53 dB from the three locations during an event. For a point of reference, 65 dB would be equivalent to you and I standing in a room together, approximately 3' apart, speaking in normal tones and voices. 52-54dB would be half that loud. The predicted 52-54 dB levels will be audible at the neighboring properties but the levels are 10 dB less than what you'd hear if someone were talking to you at a normal level of speech.

I hope this clarifies some things. Please let me know if you have any other questions. I look forward to discussing this further on Thursday.

Sincerely,

Megan Martin, MCRP
Planner II
Planning & Building Department
976 Osos Street, Rm. 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Hi Megan,

Thanks for your well considered answers to my questions regarding the Villa St. Juliette Winery expansion. I appreciate the effort and clarity reflected in your responses.

As I suggested in my initial e-mail below, I have additional questions regarding this project. Unfortunately, I have run out of time to prepare and send these in advance, so will have to ask them at the hearing on Thursday.

However, I have one question in the form of a request - would it be possible for Lynda Auchinachie to be available to represent the Department of Agriculture perspective, as she often does?

Thanks,

Ken